

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/777,162	02/13/2004	Matthias Slodowski	064192-0107	5100		
22428 FOLEV AND	7590 10/02/2007 LARDNER LLP		EXAM	EXAMINER		
SUITE 500		STOCK JR,	STOCK JR, GORDON J			
3000 K STREI WASHINGTO			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	,		2877			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			MAIL DATE			
	•		10/02/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			23
,	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/777,162	SLODOWSKI, MAT	THIAS
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gordon J. Stock	2877	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 September 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE TH	IIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliar time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of owing replies: (1) an amendment, af otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $3$ months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	ng date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	706.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of eunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	extension and the corresponding amount e shortened statutory period for reply orige er than three months after the mailing da b).	of the fee. The appropr pinally set in the final Offi ate of the final rejection, o	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any ext a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be file</li> </ol>	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS	but with the date of filtre a build	£	
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection         <ul> <li>(a)</li></ul></li></ol>	onsideration and/or search (see NC low); etter form for appeal by materially re	OTE below); educing or simplifying	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)		jected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	•	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s			(
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	•	, timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pr The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,6-13 and 16-20. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	out before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>ne</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filin entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the sufficient reasons.</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeary and was not earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	out door NOT place the application	in condition for allows	nce becours:
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by			nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)  13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	. (PTO/SB/08) Paper Nb(s).	107	

Continuation of 13. Other: The applicant's arguments filed on September 13, 2007 have been fully considered but are not found persuasive by the Examiner. In regards to the arguments of claim 1 on page 2 of Remarks concerning that Birkner 'does not teach or suggest that any inspection and/or imaging is done during the transport from the load port to the workstation, i.e. while the substrate is being conveyed on the substrate conveying module 1' it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., inspection and/or imaging during transport from the load port to the workstation) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The limitation 'wherein the measurement unit for thin-layer macrometrology is configured such that an image of an entire surface of the substrate is acquired does not preclude macroinspection while the substrate is not being moved between stations or between load ports and workstations. As for the Sandland reference being incompatible because Sandland teaches two transfer mechanisms, an arm and turntable, Examiner disagrees. Sandland's transfer system comprises both the arm and the turntable. See Sandland's Fig. 2:52. In addition, 'such that the semiconductor substrates are transported from the cassette element beneath the measurement unit for thin-layer macrometrology to the first measurement unit for thin-layer micrometrology' does not preclude having another transport device performing this particular transport function. In regards to claims 2,3,7-9 please see response to claim 1 arguments above. As for the arguments in regards to claims 10-13, 16, 18, see response to claim 1 arguments above. In addition, in regards to the limitation of claim 10 'during transport to the measurement unit for thin-layer micrometrology' does not preclude having another transport mechanism perform this transport function. Also 'acquiring an image of an entire surface of the semiconductor substrates in the measurement unit for thin-layer macrometrology' does not preclude macroinspection while the substrate is not being moved between stations.